1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND		
. 3			
4			
5	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
6	THE ESTATE OF YARON UNGAR, *		
7	ET AL *		
8	VS. * JULY 15, 2002 * 2:00 P.M.		
9	THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY, * ET AL *		
10	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * PROVIDENCE, RI		
11			
12	BEFORE MAGISTRATE JUDGE DAVID L. MARTIN		
13			
14	(Plaintiffs' Motion to Enter Default Judgment)		
15	23 pm		
16	APPEARANCES:		
17	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: DAVID J. STRACHMAN, ESQ.		
18	McIntyre, Tate, Lynch & Holt 321 South Main Street		
19	Suite 400 Providence, RI 02903		
20			
21	Court Reporter: Karen M. Zinni, RPR-RMR-CRR		
22	One Exchange Terrace Providence, RI 02903		
23			
24	ORIGINAL DE LA CORIGINAL DE LA CORIGINA DE LA		
25	Proceeding reported and produced by computer-aided stenography		



1	INDEX	
2	PLAINTIFF WITNESS	PAGE
3	Allan Brenman	
4	Direct Examination by Mr. Strachman	4
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	PLAINTIFF EXHIBITS FOR ID	IN FULL
10	16 17	29 29
11	19-24	6 30
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		1
24		
25		

KAREN M. ZINNI, RPR-RMR-CRR

```
15 JULY 2002 -- AFTERNOON SESSION
  1
  2
               THE COURT: This is the matter of the Estate of
 3
        Yaron Ungar, et al, versus The Palestinian Authority,
 4
        et al, Civil Action Number 00-105L. This is a
 5
        continuation of a hearing on the Plaintiffs' motion to
        enter default judgment against Defendants HAMAS and
 6
 7
        HAMAS operatives.
 8
               Mr. Strachman, will you state your full name,
 9
        please.
10
               MR. STRACHMAN: David Strachman for the
11
        Plaintiffs.
12
               THE COURT: Are you ready to proceed?
13
               MR. STRACHMAN: Yes, your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Call your first witness.
15
               MR. STRACHMAN: Thank you. Allan Brendan.
16
                ALLAN BRENMAN, PLAINTIFF WITNESS, SWORN
               THE CLERK: Could you please state your name and
17
       spell your last name for the record.
18
19
               THE WITNESS: Alan Brenman, B-R-E-N-M-A-N.
              THE COURT: Is your first name spelled A-L-A-N?
20
21
               THE WITNESS: Double L-A-N.
22
              THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Strachman.
23
              MR. STRACHMAN:
                               Thank you.
24
```

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STRACHMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Dr. Brenman, what is your profession?
- A. I'm a licensed psychologist.
 - Q. And where were you educated in that profession?
- A. My doctorate and master's are from Harvard University School of Education.
 - Q. If you're a psychologist, why were you in the School of Education?
- A. The School of Education has a Department of Human Development and Psychology where a lot of students who wish to do more clinical -- clinically related work go to school and receive their training there.
- Q. And you have a master's degree as well from Harvard?
- 16 A. Right.
 - Q. And in what area of psychology do you --
 - A. In child psychology.
 - Q. You're a child psychologist?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And can you tell us a little bit about your experience and where you've worked.
- A. I did my training in the Boston area at the
 Franciscan Children's Hospital working with children
 with emotional and behavioral problems. I've done an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

internship at the Dana Farber Cancer Institute working with children and families of cancer patients and a year at the Kennedy Memorial Hospital doing my clinical internship also working with children with medical, cognitive and emotional problems.

After graduation, I did a year of post-doctoral training in the Department of Child and Family Psychiatry at Rhode Island Hospital.

- Q. Subsequently, you were employed as a psychologist?
- A. Yes, I'm self-employed in private practice.
- Q. Were you on the staff of Bradley Hospital?
- A. I worked part time in the Outpatient Department at Bradley for four years.
 - Q. Is that a child psychiatric hospital?
 - A. Yes, it's a total child hospital.
 - Q. And subsequent to working there, did you -- have you worked in any other -- did you have any other jobs as a psychologist other than your private practice?
 - A. I worked for Roger Williams Hospital running some bereavement groups for the Hope Center for Life Enhancement, running a group for men with prostate cancer; and I work as a clinical consultant currently with the Department of Human Services helping to run a Medicaid program for disabled children.
 - Q. In front of you, do you have a copy of Exhibit

```
1
        Number 15 -- excuse me, 17?
 2
        Α.
            My resume.
 3
        Q.
            You prepared that?
 4
        Α.
            Yes.
 5
               MR. STRACHMAN:
                               I'd ask that that be marked as a
 6
        full exhibit.
 7
               THE COURT:
                           It may be so marked.
 8
               MR. STRACHMAN:
                               Thank you.
 9
               (Plaintiff's Exhibit 17 was admitted as a full
10
       exhibit)
           And could you tell us, Doctor, about your
11
       experience in the field of child psychology.
12
13
           I began my training in 1986 working with children
       with emotional and behavioral problems.
14
                                                  One of the
15
       areas of specialty that I've worked in is the whole
       area of bereavement, death and grief work starting with
16
       the work I did at the Dana Farber Cancer Institute
       working with children with cancer and their families.
           Subsequent to that, do you have other experience
       Q.
       dealing with children as a child psychologist?
           Well, my practice currently is about 50 to 60
       Α.
       percent working with children and adolescents.
           And have you dealt with people -- I think you told
       us a little bit about grief and bereavement groups.
```

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Have you dealt with children whose family has suffered

a trauma or children who have lost a parent?

1.3

A. That's one of the areas of specialty that I work in. I get referrals from hospitals when there is a parent with cancer or who has recently died; and I will counsel the children, the family through the grief and bereavement period.

I've worked with children from abusive homes in helping them and the families deal with the emotional consequences of those behaviors; and most recently I've treated a family who's lost somebody in the September 11th attack.

- Q. And have you dealt with, in your practice that deals with adults, have you dealt with -- have you been involved in the bereavement and grief field?
- A. All the time, either through working with the families where one of the parents has died from cancer or some other terminal illness through running bereavement groups for adults who have lost a loved one in their families.
- Q. You told us that you were involved in grief counselling. Could you tell us what that entails, what that means?
- A. It means that at various points after a loss, I help people to cope with the intense feelings that they experience, natural feelings that they experience as a

```
result of a death or a loss that they experience. Very often for children it's helping them to label their feelings, helping them to express their feelings in different ways, to normalize it, help them to explain the grief process and provide a lot of support during this period which can last up to a couple of years after a death.
```

MR. STRACHMAN: Your Honor, I'd ask that Dr. Brenman be qualified as both a child psychologist and expert in grief counselling.

THE COURT: Granted.

MR. STRACHMAN: Thank you.

- Q. Now, Dr. Brenman, did you have an opportunity to meet with Dvir and Yishai Unger?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And did you meet with the Dasberg family?
- 17 A. Yes, I did.
- 18 Q. And do you speak Hebrew, by the way?
- 19 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Were you able to speak to them in Hebrew directly?
- A. To the children I spoke directly in Hebrew and to the grandparents in English.
- Q. And did you speak to -- could you tell us what you learned about how they're doing and how they're functioning, specifically the children.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α. In my conversations with the children, it was more superficial, how are you doing and how was the trip in, a little bit about why they were here. didn't go into an in-depth assessment of them, but I did with the grandparents. And I was able to observe the interactions between the grandparents and the grandchildren.

From what I could gather from the grandparents, overall the children are doing quite well now. They're in school, and they're doing well. They have positive relationships with their grandparents and other members of the family. They've got some friends. Socially they seem to be doing fairly well as well.

There were a number of points, though, that I picked up on that I did have some concerns about. the older boy, Dvir, who is eight years old, one of the things that I observed and that the grandmother also attested to was his overprotectiveness of his younger brother, constantly where is the younger brother, even at home, prefers to play with the younger brother and his friends rather than be with children his own age and older; and this seems to be accepted by everybody.

But he's very protective of wanting to play with his younger brother and aware of where he's at, almost to the point of a dependency, which is somewhat odd.

2.0

2.1

You wouldn't expect that from an older brother who typically is off with their own friends and wants very little to do with their younger sibling. That was one thing that I noticed.

The other thing that the grandmother talked a little bit about was with Yishai, the younger boy who is seven, beginning to show a temper and some anger, which is new to him. And they're not quite sure where this is coming from, but she's observed that and is aware of that. And Dvir has had some -- the older boy has some aggressive behavior recently in school as well that they're worried about.

- Q. And why, if at all, is that notable?
- A. Well, any kind of aggressiveness is notable. You know, an incident of aggression here or there is not unusual; but if it's a pattern of behavior that is sustained and continues, we would want to look at it and explore it further to see where it's coming from, what the source is. We would need ongoing monitoring supervision.
- Q. And how did they -- did you discuss with the parents or with the children -- excuse me, the Dasbergs, the grandparents, how the children are reacting to their parents' death?
- A. Yes. We went back -- I wanted to learn a little

bit about what happened right at the time of the murders, and --

Q. What did you learn about that?

A. That overall there was somewhat of an emotional reaction that would have been expected. I mean, these children were 9 months and about 20 months old, and we would expect there to be an emotional reaction. At this age, if you think about it, children, all they know is their parents. Even at 9 months old, babies react more to their parents visually than they do to anybody else, even from birth. They know their parents best of all.

And after 9 months old, that's where they feel their security. They reach to their parents, they want their parents and certainly at 20 months old the relationship only deepens. And during this time there are some psychological events that we see, stranger anxieties and separation anxieties, that are normal for all children to go through; but this was the time where their parents were killed and they were separated forever from their parents.

There was some crying and distress from the baby, to some extent hard to console for the nine-month-old, for Yishai. It's hard to say exactly what the separation did for these children; but we do

know that, even thinking about it, the two people in their lives to provide them with safety and security were taken away. Children don't have the language to express what that's like, but all we know is that that is a trauma. That's a psychic trauma for these children that they have endured and they live with.

For the 20-month-old as well it is -- there was a larger connection, a deeper connection with his parents; and how he understands why they're not there is difficult to say and may take time, certainly in the future, to figure out how they're sort of incorporating this event.

The other thing that happened was that the older boy, Dvir, became -- at that point, that's when he became very attached to his younger brother, wanted him around, and that didn't surprise me at all. This is what he knew of his nuclear family. That's all that was left of the four of them. So it makes sense to me that even at that young age, he would want something that is familiar and comforting to him around him.

Q. Did you learn anything else about the period subsequent to -- immediately following their parents' death?

A. Overall it sounds like the children have done quite well in attaching to their grandparents. These are

2.3

people that they knew, so it wasn't totally foreign.

One thing that I did note in talking to the grandmother was how she coped because if she became -- she became the surrogate parent, so to speak. She took an attitude of there will be no sadness, I will not deal with sadness, I will take this event and I will transform it into something positive, a way to keep her daughter's memory alive; and she said her family adopted the same attitude.

And we have to commend them for taking on this challenge and this task of raising these children, and in the short term that's a wonderful way to cope. She got through that, she was able to provide these boys — she wanted to provide the best life for them that she could.

On the other hand, I have some serious concerns about that. There has to be sadness. There has to be room for these boys to feel sad that their parents have died and are not there. And in the long term, that could cause some kind of problems in the future for them. If sadness isn't tolerated, if sadness is not allowed, if they're not shown how to handle sadness, that certainly could be a source of problems in the future.

O. What do these children face in the near term?

1.8

They're now eight and seven. What do they face in sort of the next period of life?

A. Well, at each developmental stage, they will have to almost be -- have to deal with their parents' death all over again. As their brains develop and cognitively become more complex and their ability to understand things in a more abstract way and at a deeper level, they will take in this information over and over again.

So even now they are asking more questions than they did two years ago or four years ago, and that will continue. At each stage, they will ask questions and be able to understand it more and more and in more depth.

- Q. What did you learn, if anything, about the questions that they're asking?
- A. They don't ask a lot. They ask, though, about the information, what happened. They want to know that they've been given -- more recently, Yishai, the younger boy, asked, Is there anything else that I don't know about? You know, Have you told me everything? Which raises -- to me it means, you know, can I trust that you're really providing me with all the information.

And, again, at seven years old, he's only

2.0

capable of handling a certain amount of information. It raises questions for them now and I think in the future about their religious convictions. How could -- if you believe in a God that is all powerful, how could God allow this to happen to them? They're already asking that kind of question. And certainly as they develop their own sense of identity, their own sense of a religious identity, it would not be unreasonable for them to think that -- that's going to be questioned as a result of this act.

- Q. You discussed the grandparents and this sort of mechanism or method that they have to deal with this loss, the lack of grieving. Does that impact the children right now? Is that causing an impact on the children?
- A. Not necessarily right now; but, you know, looking down in the future, these children will have to mourn the death of their parents in order to sort of -- they are being brought up -- also, it's important to remember the context that these children are being brought up in.

Their parents, as the mother said, they're sort of all around. There are pictures of them around. They've published the books from the mother's drawings, from the comic strips. They're very involved in the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

works of this mother. So it's not like these parents are sort of not discussed and not talked about. issue that their parents have died is constantly there for them. They are growing up with that.

And it's also important to remember that, as opposed to when children are older and they have memories of a parent, these children were too young to have any memories from their parents. Any information they have is what's being provided to them by their families, by the grandparents. That's very different because there's almost like an absence or an emptiness as a result of their parents' death.

- Do they, in fact, have any memories of their Q. parents? I mean, at age 9 months and 20 or 22 months, do they form any memories of their parents?
- No, not at that point. It's more of a sensory They certainly would know their mother's and their father's smell, their father's feel, et cetera; but memories of events, no. The brain isn't developed enough at that age to encode that kind of information.
- So they, then, would grow up not having any memories of their parents?
- Α. Right, which makes it more difficult to mourn and When I work with kids who have lost a parent, I create a memory book with them. They bring in

25

pictures. We tell stories. I audio tape them. I write things down for them to create a document that is theirs of their memories. This helps with the bereavement. This helps them to connect with the person who is gone; and it helps, again, the process of grieving.

These children don't have that. Anything that they have is from other people's memories. What children do then is create in their minds almost a fantasy of this person who has died, their relationship with this person who has died; and this is something that lasts throughout life because there's an emptiness there that has to be filled, and they can fill it, and there are any number of ways that they can fill it.

It's not uncommon for people to make a martyr out of the parent who has died. These happen to be wonderful people, but their children can even make that into something larger than life.

- Q. Why is that a problem?
- A. Well, it can be a problem because you can never measure up to it. We are constantly aware of our parents' approval of us, want our parents' approval, want our parents to be proud of us. That is a very natural tendency for people, even grown adults, to want their parents to be pleased with them, to want that

approval.

2.0

When you have a parent who is larger than life, it's almost as if you can never fill that void, you can never be good enough, and that's a lot of pressure to grow up in. They know their mother was a very talented artist, their father was a learned man, a wonderful teacher. They could develop very high expectations of themselves based on what they know of their parents. And, again, growing up with this kind of pressure can be very, very difficult.

- Q. How is that different if their parents, you know, survived but were very talented? In other words, they grew up in their household. Their father was going to be a teacher and rabbi and their mother an illustrator, a well-known sort of personality.
- A. Because they would have a relationship with that person who would be able to guide them, to talk with them, to demystify things. Somebody could say, you know, it looks like this, but this is the reality of the situation, and also just to help them out.

In the absence of that, kids have magical thinking. They think differently than adults, and they can grow up with these fantasies that can last a lifetime; and that's where it can be very, very difficult for them as they grow up.

O. Is there evidence of that now?

2.2

A. The only evidence that the grandmother talked about was the similarities between the boys and their parents; that the older boy very much is like his father, more studious, more serious in book learning and the younger one is more of a freer spirit and artistic type. I don't know if the parents -- if the grandparents are sort of pegging them to some extent, that you're like your father, you're like your mother, which also can provide comparisons that could be unrealistic for the boys. That's all that I noticed in seeing them.

Q. When you discussed the role of the grandparents or the grandparents' sort of method of reacting to the death, are there things they could do to sort of improve things for the children? In other words, are they part of the problem for these kids in terms of growing up, or are they a plus for the children?

A. They're a net plus. They think, again, given the situation, they are doing, number one, the best job that they can and a fine job at bringing these boys up. They have to also deal with their own reactions and grief to this; and any way that helps them to survive it and move on to provide a nurturing home for these boys, you know, can't be really criticized.

That doesn't mean there's not room for improvement. Nothing's perfect. Nobody's perfect. So I think they're trying the best they can, but there are certain things that are inevitable in this situation. The fact that these boys will have to mourn their parents, the fact that they have been brought up without a relationship with their parents, the fact that they may long their whole lives to fill this emptiness is inevitable. That can't be filled by anybody.

- Q. And how is that feeling, how is that going to be manifest, say, in -- when they become adolescents or young adults?
- A. Well, adolescence is an interesting time of life where you're really developing your sense of self, who you are, your identity, where you come from, what do you believe in, who am I, and it's very much related to your parents, where you're coming from; and although they have grandparents, these are still grandparents raising children.

It's not the same as parents, and even the grandmother noted she's spoiling them. She's different in how she's raising them than she is with her own children that she raised.

Q. How is that a problem or how does that affect the

kids?

A. Well, they're not as tight with them. They may not allow them to sort of suffer a little bit. We all -you know, I have kids. You know, you can't say yes all the time. You have to be able to say no and teach the kid to be able to tolerate that. If the children aren't given a lot of chances to tolerate any painful experiences, then they do grow up in a different way, having expectations, being less self-sufficient, not working as hard.

So there could be ramifications in the future as a result of that, and some of this is going to come out during adolescence where they're really going to be beginning to rebel from their homes and trying to become independent. And that's where I see potential for some of the psychological problems, anxieties of going out on their own, becoming independent, where they have been somewhat protected, anxieties of, well, how do I enter into the world when this happened to my parents. You know, that's potential that could happen to me, too.

So issues of anxiety are very large here, fear of other deaths, you know, the fear that if it happened once already, and again they're growing up with death all around them in a sense. These parents are ever

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The magnitude

present in a way. So the fear of losing other people in their life. They are more susceptible and vulnerable to issues of these fears, fears of death, fear of separation from people. So adolescence potentially is a very difficult time for them. What about after adolescence, once they're sort of young adults? Again, in the literature, and even in the people that I've treated, difficulties that they experience are really one of forming other relationships, issues of trust, being able to become close with somebody without the fear of them having -- leaving you or abandoning you. That's a fairly common and big issue for young people with an early loss. Again, they're very susceptible to these feelings of fear of somebody leaving them. And do these feelings and this anxiety that you mentioned, do these kinds of feelings and issues dissipate over time, or will they remain with these children for the rest of their lives? It's hard to exactly say now what will happen. believe that they will have to deal with all of these issues at some point in their lifetime.

they will have to struggle with these issues to me is a

and the intensity is very hard to say. The fact that

given. That's just part of who they are, part of how they've developed as a result of their parents' being murdered at such a young age and this loss in their life. That they will have to do.

They will have to, again, go through a mourning period at different parts in their life. It is not uncommon at each milestone in a person's life, when they finish high school, when they start a university, when they graduate, when they get married, it brings up losses. It's bittersweet. It's great that these things are happening, but it would have been nice had my parents been there. What would my parents have been like? What advice would my parents give me in these circumstances? And they won't have that. So that at each point they will have to suffer the loss all over again.

- Q. What will the loss -- ultimately the loss of their grandparents, you know, who are raising them, how will that impact them?
- A. I would think pretty significantly because it catapults them into being orphaned a second time by the people who basically raised them, at a much younger age; that they're being raised by a generation older than their parents, and they will die sooner. That's a given. And, again, any loss -- previous losses sort of

are compounded by the earlier ones.

So that potentially could be an incredibly difficult time for them, you know, feelings of being alone in the world. You know, this is all they had, and now they're gone; and chances are these boys are going to be quite young when that happens. A lot of this, again, left untreated or at its worst can be some serious depression where there's a sense of hopelessness and loneliness and sadness. At the extreme end is suicide, which happens, but, you know, that is an extreme, to anxiety disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder.

It is not inconceivable that at some point in their lives they will hear about these murders from the outside, not necessarily from their families. They can read about it. Pictures are available. In order -- it is possible that kids become traumatized again even hearing about the information in the future. You don't have to be at the event to suffer a stress disorder. So they are susceptible to that in the future as well just by gathering information about what happened; and, again, during adolescence, young adulthood, that's when people think about, Well, where did I come from? Who were these people? And their own investigations about what happened could lead to them being traumatized all

over again.

- Q. I just wanted to go back for one second. The actual trauma or potential trauma of actually being in that car for Yishai, is there any evidence that he suffered any particularized trauma that sort of affects him?
- A. There's no outward evidence. A lot of this is invisible, you know, and it also depends on the way you understand child development. If you think about this child having heard the gunshots, crying, startle response, which most likely happened, crying as a result without their primary caretaker responding, on a sensory level, that's a trauma. How long he was in the car before somebody found them is unknown. It might have been hours and hours.

Then the, again, ripping away the parents, who are the main source of safety and security for these children, even at nine months old is a trauma. How that encodes in the brain, we don't exactly know; but the fact that it was a trauma to him, that he experienced that is true, making him susceptible and vulnerable to some psychological problems in the future.

Q. And is that, then, basically your conclusion as to how this loss affects these children? In other words,

you've told us that they seem to be doing pretty good now, pretty well?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. And they are subject to some issues in terms of their behavior but nothing that is clinical or has --
- A. Right.
- Q. -- immediate ramifications?
- A. Exactly.
 - Q. Or immediate implications; is that right?
- 10 A. Right.
- Q. Is what, then, you're telling us that these
 children are at risk for these kinds of sufferings down
 the road?
- A. Absolutely.
 - Q. And can you discuss what that means because I just want to be clear for the Court in terms of we're not -- you're not saying, from what I understand, that right now these kids are debilitated. You don't know that they will be debilitated, but you know that they're at risk. What does that mean?
 - A. Right. All I can say now is that they are different than their peers. They are being brought up by their grandparents because their parents were murdered. That's not a typical case scenario, and their friends are aware of that and the community is

aware of that. So they are being brought up somewhat differently than a regular child, an average child.

But yes, the ramifications of this are a lot in the future, but they are susceptible to deal with issues of depression and anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of this in the future.

They will have a lot of issues to sort of work through in their lifetime as a result.

- Q. Is there any way to know if these issues are going to manifest themselves to the extent that they will need intensive treatment or counselling or suffer any of the sort of particularized types of manifestations that you referenced before?
- A. There's no way to -- I can't say yes or no. I wouldn't -- you know, again, given these situations, I wouldn't be surprised given the adults that I've treated where there's been a significant loss in the past, I wouldn't be surprised if, yes, at some point in their lifetime they would need some kind of psychotherapy to help them cope with the feelings that come up.

It also depends on their personalities.

Everybody responds differently, even to these situations where death -- they've grown up, again, with death. Some people respond by it limits them. They

sort of become a viewer of life because of that sadness and emptiness. They don't participate as fully because of that depression. Other people become risk-takers, and they almost defy death. You can't get me. And those are the ones jumping out -- the James Dean types who take risks and almost defy it. You can't get me. You got my parents. You're not going to get me. That puts people at certain risks as well.

So, again, it's hard to determine exactly how these boys are going to respond in the future, but all I know is they have a huge psychological and emotional battle to deal with in their lifetime as a result.

MR. STRACHMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: You may step down, Doctor. Thank you.

MR. STRACHMAN: Your Honor, I would just like at this point, if I could, to introduce some remaining exhibits. We have provided to the Court an original and a copy of the notice to the Defendants that we provided on June 25, 2002, of this hearing. I'd like that to be made part of the record that they were particularly notified of this hearing. We also have --

THE COURT: We'll do that. Has it been designated?

MR. STRACHMAN: Yes, your Honor. That's

1.3

Number 15. THE COURT: All right. So 15 is full. (Plaintiff's Exhibit 15 was admitted as a full exhibit) MR. STRACHMAN: Thank you. Your Honor, we also had a copy of the book that was written about Dvir by his mother. I would like to mark that as Number 16. THE COURT: It may be marked as a full exhibit. (Plaintiff's Exhibit 16 was admitted as a full exhibit)

MR. STRACHMAN: Thank you. And also, your Honor, today we provided to the Court, a copy of which is on your Honor's bench, the original's with your Honor's clerk, several additional exhibits that are really in the form of government documents. I filed those documents in response to your Honor's inquiry to Professor Unger, and I thought it might be helpful to the Court.

And those are Items 19 through 24, and those are government references to the murder of Yaron Unger as an American citizen, and they include -- excuse me, those are 20 through 24, and I've outlined the page numbers as well. A couple of the documents are long.

Number 19, your Honor, is an FBI document that attests to the activities of the HAMAS in the United States. I

would like to add that as well, particularly in reference to your Honor's question before the hearing as to the HAMAS's activities in the United States. So we would move for 19 through 24 to be admitted as full exhibits.

THE COURT: They may be so admitted as full exhibits.

(Plaintiff's Exhibits 19 through 24 were admitted as full exhibits)

MR. STRACHMAN: Thank you. And I had a question for your Honor, if I may, as to your Honor's ruling the other day. Will the Court be issuing an order following the hearing on Mr. Sherman's motion? Shall counsel prepare an order?

THE COURT: This is with regard to my ruling denying the PLO or the PA standing in effect to participate in the hearing? Is that what you're referring to?

MR. STRACHMAN: Well, I think the ruling was more in terms of the proceeding going forward. I think that -- their objection was to going forward, not really to participating. I just didn't know if your Honor was preparing an order or if you would like me to.

THE COURT: I would like you to, Mr. Strachman.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. STRACHMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Let me just consult my notes, because I did take notes, so I can refresh my memory as to what that ruling was. According to my notes, Mr. Strachman, I overruled the objection filed by the PA and the PLO to the hearing going forward. may reduce that to an order, and I'll sign it.

MR. STRACHMAN: Thank you. Lastly, your Honor, if it would be helpful to the Court, I'd like to provide a closing; and we also have a brief summary of damages that I'd like to present to the Court as well in written form.

THE COURT: You may do so.

MR. STRACHMAN: Your Honor, much of what I would say is contained in our memo, and I don't want to be repetitive, but I think what's crucial in this case at this stage of the proceedings is that we have a very clear statute, a statute that is somewhat unique in the sense that it has not been utilized frequently; but it is crystal clear in the statutory, legislative history, both in the memorandum that we previously filed with this Court and the memorandum that I just filed this afternoon, as to what the intent was.

The intent was extremely clear, and that is to provide a tool for Americans to fight terrorists in

their own way, and that is through the courts in utilizing explicitly all weapons, quote, "all weapons available to litigants." The quotes and the statements, the sentiments of Congress are included in the very detailed legislative history that is quoted at length in our brief.

And this proceeding, I think, has an opportunity for the first time to really implement that to its full extent; and to that extent, Judge, I would ask that the full panoply of relief that we're asking for in this case be granted.

First, we start with the proceeding not against the PLO, who helped provide material support, et cetera, to these terrorists, but to the actual triggermen themselves and the organization, the terrorist organization to which they belong. And I think that's crucial; that in such a case, to disallow the full panoply of relief to be granted would somehow send the diametrically opposite result or message that Congress intended.

And here we have a statute where Congress went out of its way to create jurisdiction in this Court, to create mechanisms for service, to create an expanded class of Plaintiffs, to even allow treble damages in its own -- in Congress's own analysis of how to provide

2.1

a punitive type of element for these terrorists. And here we've asked to fully implement that statute such that we're asking for not only economic damages, as the witnesses testified to, lost wages, the lost services to these children, but also to the estate, the family and the heirs, survivors as explicitly mentioned in the statute.

While this case is somewhat unique in the sense that it is literally the first case brought under this statute that I think has ever been identified, no one has been able to identify another case that was filed under this statute, what we do have is we have a very clear analogy for measuring damages, for dealing with some of the losses that the Unger family has suffered and that the children particularly will suffer going forward.

Those cases are all outlined very clearly -hopefully very clearly in our memorandum, and that is
an analogy to the 1996 act which amended the Foreign
Sovereign Immunities Act. That act is a little bit
different. It sets things up a little bit differently,
but courts have clearly said how to measure damages and
how to address issues very much just like this case in
cases against the sponsors of terrorism.

Here we have measures of damages that we're

seeking against the actual triggermen and their terrorist organization, HAMAS.

We would ask the Court, as we've outlined in our memorandum, to analogize the damages so that the family members who testify and who are seeking compensation in the form of damages would fit within the same sort of general guidelines that were made in those Foreign Sovereign Immunities cases.

Each of those cases allow for emancipated -excuse me, involved or many of the cases involved
emancipated adults, family members of emancipated
adults receiving an award for their pain and suffering.
So, too, for minor children, in many cases for children
whose fathers were taken captive and ultimately
returned to them, unlike the case here. And what's
crucial, I think, also to recognize is that the
suffering here is, it's sort of awkward to say, but not
the generalized suffering that a person would have
knowing that a family member died.

This isn't a car accident case, and that's why Dr. Freedman isn't an accident reconstructionist. He is a person who testifies as to how this person -- how Yaron Unger was killed, following the police report, following the records of the police who investigated this scene.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This gentleman, Mr. Unger, 26, witnessed his wife's death. He faced her while she was dying. turned facing her, facing the terrorists. He knew his son was in the back seat. Within, as the testimony was, approximately 30 seconds, he would have lost consciousness and died; but his last final seconds were knowing that his wife's -- literally the back of her head was blown off by shots that struck straight through the headrest of her seat, just bypassing, thank God, this little nine-month-old child, not knowing what happened to that child because this car was riddled with 50 bullets.

And the horror that he suffered, the horror that his family suffers is somewhat unimaginable. It's not akin to much else, I think, that comes before this Court or certainly before counsel in terms of our practices, in terms of dealing with damages. children will always know how their parents died. they get older, as Dr. Brenman said, if they independently look for records, they will know that -they will see these pictures. They will see picture of how their father was killed, and that is an unimaginable horror.

So the damages in this case, I think, have to reflect that scenario. The cases that deal with

terrorism specifically address those kinds of issues. A loss from terrorism is unlike a car accident case in the sense that it's entirely unexpected. There's entirely no analogy that someone could use or someone could make for dealing with the grief and the suffering.

absolutely innocent, two young people not involved in politics, not carrying weapons, not involved in any movements or politics or anything, just coming back from a colleague's wedding, and to see their family devastated this way is an unimaginable suffering. And as Dr. Brenman said, thankfully the suffering that these children will potentially suffer is in a sense in the form of their vulnerability, their vulnerability to these types of syndromes, this anxiety.

Excellent grandparents. There's no denying that, and we're fortunate for that; but they have to carry this with them for the rest of their lives. When their grandparents die and they're in their fifties, when they die 20 or 30 years from now, these children will be, as Dr. Brenman said, in a sense orphaned again. Hopefully they can deal with it in a good fashion.

And it's not clear, and I don't want to

2.3

overstate the case either, we're not saying these kids will absolutely suffer in this way. No one can predict that, and no one knows that, and the kids are doing fairly well now, it's obvious; but to live with this kind of a burden, to live with this risk and this vulnerability demands an in-kind measure of damages.

And I would ask the Court to make the analogy between the loss of comfort and society in the Foreign Sovereign Immunities cases to this case.

It's particularly crucial, your Honor, to do so here for another reason. In each of those cases, in virtually every single one except, as I'm aware of, except really basically one case, they involve an indirect party, the party that supplied Hizbollah with weapons, the party that trained Hizbollah or even trained HAMAS members.

Here the awkward situation is that when Congress created this statute, they gave a measure of punitive damages. The punitive damages are the threefold damages. So the strange thing here is that the measure, the ultimate total of damages in this case may very well be less than the punitive damages awarded in cases against the mere sponsors, the financing parties.

And I think that was an unintended consequence by Congress. It clearly can't be that Congress said

the triggermen get -- are on the hook for less than the state sponsor because the state sponsor we made an exception, we allow punitive damages to apply; but Yaron Unger had fairly modest means, he was a schoolteacher, and the income -- that even trebled loss of income is a fairly modest sum or relatively modest sum, as it were.

So to that extent, I think the Court -- we urge the Court to implement all measures of damages in the broadest fashion, and I think that's particularly intended.

I would bring the Court -- in that light, I would bring the Court's attention to specific references that are made in the record and are identified in our brief. I won't belabor the Court with this citation. When this statute was first -- when this bill was first drafted in 1990, and it has a little bit of a tortured history, it was enacted in '90, it was repealed by mistake, literally by mistake, and reenacted the next year. The citations and the sources are clarified for the Court in our submission. But the first draft of this bill did not allow suits on behalf of heirs and survivors.

The Department of Justice testified at the hearing that, in order to clarify who was on the hook

2.4

and what the potential remedies for families of terrorists would be, asked Congress to specifically include the word "heirs and survivors." By doing so, they specifically said it would make clear that the families of Americans who are killed can bring suit and can recover in their own right.

Congress gladly, to the best of my knowledge, without any objection, made that very simple change. And, in fact, that's how we have the law now. So now the law reads -- Section 233(a) says the estate, heirs and survivors can bring suit. And it could be that that is the remedy for, in a sense, the disparate treatment between the gunmen on the one hand and the sponsors on the other hand; that by allowing a broad range of damages and by using, as Senator Grassley I believe said, quote, "all weapons available to litigants," unquote, there could be some measure of justice obtained in the form of huge judgments that potentially could bankrupt these organizations and bankrupt the parties who are doing these horrible and evil types of deeds. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Strachman.

Mr. Strachman, you are correct that the Court continues to have some concerns about the issue of personal jurisdiction, and my inclination is to schedule a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

hearing for later in this week where you can be prepared on that single issue and I can also focus my thoughts on it and perhaps ask questions that are not clearly formulated in my mind at the present time but I think after I review your materials will be more clearly formulated. Are you available Friday afternoon at 2:00?

> I will be, sure. MR. STRACHMAN:

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to schedule a hearing in this matter for 2:00 this Friday where I'd like you to be prepared to argue the existence of personal jurisdiction both as to the HAMAS organization and also as to the individual operatives; and the Court, I anticipate, will have some questions in the course of your presentation.

I think the total amount of time will not exceed It may be less than that; but since I one hour. concluded that I must make a determination that there is personal jurisdiction in order to reach the monetary issues that you have addressed this afternoon, I deem it helpful to have a hearing on that point, on that issue by itself.

MR. STRACHMAN: Could I ask the Court if the Court -- if there's something that I might be able to supplement in terms of the record. For instance, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FBI affidavit we originally filed with the Court 20 months -- you know, in our initial motion to enter default judgment discusses the transactions involving HAMAS operatives.

The Marzook case, which is cited there, shows how Mr. Marzook was the head of the HAMAS military wing operating freely in the United States. So, too, with Mr. Salah and the One Ford Van case. So, too, with the affidavit of Yahudi Barski who indicates the publishing house was -- the web sites, the other activities of the HAMAS; and I'm just wondering if there's something else I can -- some direction the Court can give me, and I will be happy to supplement our filings or direct sort of my inquiry.

THE COURT: I would suggest you simply be familiar with the materials that you've already filed. I'm going to be reviewing them again, Mr. Strachman. If in the course of the hearing we reach a point where you feel that had you been alerted to a particular avenue of inquiry you would have supplemented the record further, I'll give you the opportunity.

I won't fault you if on Friday you find that you weren't anticipating a particular avenue of inquiry by the Court and would be able to satisfy the Court's inquiry given additional time. So I appreciate your

alerting the Court today saying that you'd be willing to try to prepare further materials for Friday. I don't think that's necessary. I'm suggesting that you just focus your preparation for that hearing on the issue of the existence of personal jurisdiction, what it is in the record that the Court should be looking at to find personal jurisdiction both as to the HAMAS organization and as to the individual operatives.

I have looked at those exhibits. I'm going to look at them again. I think if you have focused on them and I focused on them, that we'll have a productive hearing.

MR. STRACHMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Court will stand in recess.

(Court adjourned)

1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	
4	I, Karen M. Zinni, RPR-RMR-CRR, do
5	hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and
6	accurate transcription of my stenographic notes in the
7	above-entitled case.
8	
9	
10	
11	Baren M. Jane
12	Karen M. Zinni, RPR-RMR-CRR
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	- July 22, 2002
18	Date 0
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
25	
ر ک ک	

KAREN M. ZINNI, RPR-RMR-CRR